DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 988 SP 021 790

AUTHOR Schaffer, Eugene C.; And Others
TITLE Structures and Processes for Effective Collaboration among Local Schools, Colleges and Universities. A Collaborative Project of: Kannapolis City Schools, Livingstone College, University of North Carolina-Charlotte.
SPONS AGENCY North Carolina State Board of Education, Raleigh.
PUB DATE 2 Feb 83
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; Governance; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Participant Satisfaction; Participative Decision Making; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Improvement; Student Teachers; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This report investigates the structures and functions of collaboration among local schools, colleges, and universities through a survey of current research literature, a survey of local educators, and the review of existing collaborative models. An introduction states the study's purpose, presents definitions of terms used in the report, and describes the research's primary issues. A second section describes the research process, including a review of the literature, surveys and interviews, existing models, and assumptions and limitations. The report's thrid section describes a model for collaboration, including the model's characteristics and implications and recommendations for implementation. Research findings include: (1) Collaboration between schools and other educational agencies is feasible, valuable, and highly desired by professional educators; (2) Collaborative programs do exist and may be replicated; (3) Successful collaboration cannot develop without participants who are willing to share decision making; (4) Many variables (i.e., geographical location, financial support, professional interest, etc.) influence the degree to which collaboration may occur. Appendixes contain copies of the survey instruments used in the study. (Authors/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225988

STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES FOR EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION AMONG LOCAL SCHOOLS, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

FEBRUARY 2, 1983

A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT OF:

KANNAPOLIS CITY SCHOOLS

LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHARLOTTE

Schaffer, Dr. Eugene C. (Principal Investigator)
University of North Carolina, Charlotte, N. C.

Bryant, Dr. Willa C. (Principal Investigator)
Livingstone College, Salisbury, N. C.

Buchanan, Mrs. Doris - Principal
Jackson Park School, Kannapolis, N. C.

Keen, Mrs. Ann - Teacher
A. L. Brown High School, Kannapolis, N. C.

Pardue, Mrs. Betty - Teacher
Jackson Park School, Kannapolis, N. C.

Robinette, Mr. Ned G. - Assistant Superintendent
Kannapolis City Schools, Kannapolis, N. C.

SP 021 790

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eugene C. Schaffer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. Introduction 3
- A. Purpose of the Study 3
- B. Definitions 3
- C. Primary Issues 4

II. The Process 4
- A. Review of the Literature 4
  - 1. A Brief History of Collaboration 4
  - 2. Benefits and Impediments to Collaboration 5
  - 3. Implications of the Literature 6
- B. Survey and Interviews of Local Educators 8
- C. Existing Models 11
- D. Assumptions and Limitations 14

III. The Model 15
- A. Description 15
- B. Characteristics of the Model 18
- D. Implications and Recommendations for Implementation 19

The project was funded by the North Carolina State Board of Education. However, the information and opinions contained in ther report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the funding agency

ABSTRACT

This report investigates the structures and functions of collaboration through a survey of current research literature, a survey of local educators, and through the review of existing collaborative models. Some of the findings are: (1) collaboration between schools and other educational agencies is not only feasible and valuable, but is highly desired by professional educators, (2) collaborative programs do exist and may be replicated, (3) successful collaboration cannot develop without the willingness of participants to share the decision making process, (4) many variables (i.e. geographical location, financial support, professional interest, etc.) influence the degree to which collaboration may occur. Specific recommedations for collaborative activities and a suggested model are included in this report.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The compilation of this report depended upon the help of many people and the debt is acknowledged to each of them. We wish to note our gratitude to the Kannapolis City School System, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and Livingstone College for the contributions of personnel, material, and financial support. We are indebted is to many colleagues in Salisbury City, Kannapolis, Rowan County and Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Systems, more than can be acknowledged by name, who willingly shared their time and ideas and gave constant encouragement. Special acknowledgements are due Ken Howey, Roberta Devlin-Scherer and Sam Yarger for their professional critique and helpful suggestions.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Study

North Carolina established the Quality Assurance Program to develop "a systematic, continuous and extended approach" for the improvement in teacher education. Central to the assurance of quality is the concept that teacher education is not limited to a pre-service program but is a developmental process that extends through beginning employment in the profession. This developmental approach to teacher education suggests major rethinking about the roles and responsibilities of schools, universities and the State Department of Public Instruction in the training of teachers.

The Quality Assurance Program (QAP) calls for "a structure established whereby there will be a means of clarifying with institutions of higher education and with the public schools the competencies required for inclusion in professional and academic programs (including vocational education) in order to produce competent and effective teaching." Inherent in the joint resolution was the need for collaborative arrangements to include all groups that would insure effective teaching.

This report reviews the literature on collaboration, provides survey and interview information on local district personnel, recommends strategies for successful collaborative arrangements, and presents a model to support developmental teacher education programs.

B. Definitions

For the purposes of this report, terms are defined as follows:

Developmental Teacher Education Program: A developmental program includes 5 steps in the growth of a teacher. These steps as defined by Yarger and Mertens (1976) are sequential. The first step is pre-education student and can be described as an interested but not committed person. The second step is education student or a pre-service teacher. The third step is initial teacher or induction teacher which is a transitional and intensive stage during student teaching and beginning teaching. The fourth stage is a developing teacher who has career interests and tenure/credential concerns. The fifth stage is the experienced teacher stage where career concerns and adjustment of knowledge is important. This definition suggests that different planning is needed for these groups.

Collaboration refers to shared decision making in governance, planning, delivery, and evaluation of programs. It is a pluralistic form of education where people of dissimilar backgrounds work together with equal status. it may be seen as working with rather than working on a person.

Model is a simplified description of an event or series of events. It does not include all possible facets of the events but reveals the elements needed to understand and replicate the experience.

C. Primary Issues

The broadening responsibilites of teachers have incresed demands for programs that improve the quality of instruction. Beginning with initiatives at the federal level, collaboration has become a major thrust in education. Professional organizations representing many diverse opinions have supported and advanced this thrust as an important element in the preparation of teachers. Across the nation, states responded in a variety of ways to federal initiatives. North Carolina's joint resolution called for collaboration of all agencies concerned. This process was insured through the development of requests for proposals to be executed on a collaborative basis. In response to these guidelines, a research team consisting of two teachers, two professors, one principal, and a central office administrator was formed to investigate the issue of collaboration. The team member represented an elementary school, a high school, a small private college, a large state university, and an administrative unit. This team reviewed research findings, discussed issues with experts, designed surveys, conducted interviews, presented summarized findings, established models for collaboration, suggested strategies for successful arrangements and decision making, evaluated existing models, and presented a model for the State of North Carolina. These findings can be used to improve teacher education as set forth in the Quality Assurance Program (QAP).

II. The Process

A. Review of the Literature

1. A Brief History of Collaboration

The history of collaboration is not long. Prior to the advent of collective bargaining, the professionals of most educational agencies were under the umbrella of the National Educational Association which acted as the voice for the various positions and roles within the education field. With the splintering of this group, many organizations were instituted to establish and advance the desires of specific groups. Often in these circumstances, the larger questions of educational policy and benefits to school children were not addressed.

The purpose of these organizational changes were to develop parity among the various groups, and carry on the advancement of the special interests of that group. However, because of the dissimilar nature of the groups, one outcome of this change was the lack of a strong or pervasive agreement among educators about the goals of education. This fragmentation continued until the 1970's when federal agencies offered incentives to educational agencies to collaborate with other agencies and the community. Examples of these collaborative efforts might include the Urban/Rural Programs, Teacher Corps, and Teacher Centers.

The changing economic and political scene in the 1980's has reduced this role of the federal agencies and forced a greater responsibility for the cooperation of educational agencies upon the state authorities. At present, the states are attempting to develop plans, through the concensus of the various groups, for the continued development of education and to delineate the roles and responsibilities of agencies and individuals.

In North Carolina, collaboration has the potential to be a powerful method to organize various groups and integrate pre-service and in-service teacher education programs within the state. An examination of the potential benefits and limitations of collaboration efforts is presented in the next section. In addition, the implications are represented to outline the impact of the collaborative efforts on agencies and individuals involved.

2. Benefits and Impediments to Collaboration

The major impediments and benefits presented below have been gleaned from research related to teacher education, in-service education and collaboration.

BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION

* Economic savings to schools and post-secondary education (Hugh, 1975)

* Utilize the strengths of colleges and schools to develop in-service and pre-service programs (Hugh, 1975)

* Increase the public school input into content and methods courses (Schwatz, 1973)

* Involve school personnel, teachers and administrators in the professional task for inducting novices to the educational field (Smith, 1965)

* Increase the appropriateness of in-service instruction to the knowledge and methodological needs of teachers (Benderson, 1982)

* Strengthen the school curriculum through use of resource consultants from post secondary schools (Pankratz and Williams, 1974)

* Inclusion of programs in which teachers participate as helpers and planners of in-service activities tends to have greater success in accomplishing objectives than do programs which are conducted by outside personnel (Lawrence, 1977)

* Involvement and ownership is central to authentic learning, therefore, the involvement of teachers in their own continuing education is a key to collaborative work. (Howey, Bents and Corrigan, 1981)

IMPEDIMENTS TO COLLABORATION

* Lack of resources available to teacher is a significant restriction to the amount of collaborative efforts possible. Teacher education is traditionally one of the lowest funded areas in higher education (Yarger, Howey and Joyce, 1980; Roth, 1981)

* The inability to determine the amount of knowledge a classroom teacher has about field experience makes selection of co-op teachers difficult (Kysilka, 1973)

* Time scheduled to learn about field based programs is limited (Hawley and Branch, 1978)

* If school personnel are involved in planning implementation and evaluation then the question is "Who pays for released time?" (Hawley and Branch, 1978)

* There is little incentive for school or post secondary personnel to become involved in field programs. Schools do not include these skills in the description of a job nor is there a substantial reward for involvement (Hawley and Branch, 1978). In the university, off-campus work is less valued than campus based teaching in financial, promotional or tenure decision (Dazlov, 1976)

* "Professors of Education have lost authenticity and credibility as

preparers of teachers. Teachers must participate in teacher education. Teacher educators must participate as teachers." (Gore, p.3.)

* Enhancing outcomes by including perspectives of practitioners and theorists (Herring and Howey, 1982)

* Informs participants of others perspectives (Herring and Howey, 1982)

* Improved communication between local educators and college staff (Weiss, 1976)

* Collaboration would reduce stereotypes of SDPI and colleges as isolated bodies and increase their credibility (Caruso, 1981)

* There are limits to the transfer of power and resources that an organization can make or will desire to make (Byrd, 1982)

* Often "the decision-making process and impetus for change is external to the teacher education institution" (Roth, p.3).

* Special interest groups tend to influence decisions made by legislatures and State Departments of Education and, indirectly, the types of teacher training programs (Roth, 1981)

* There is a lack of conceptual framework to organize parties effectively (Yarger, et al, 1980)

* Collegs and universities have different structures from school districts (Weaver, 1981)

* Institutions desiring to share in preservice and in-service collaboration must consider extensive revision in the design of professional education (Weaver, 1981)

* Lack of skills in cooperative decision-making (Yarger, et al, 1981)

* There is a poor match between faculty skills and in-services needs (Yarger, et al, 1981)

3. Implications of the Literature

Collaboration has something for everybody, but it's difficult to achieve. Most of the literature states that collaboration is necessary and valuable, but that it occurs only in special settings or in unusual circumstances.

Yarger and Mertens (1976) suggest four major elements that must be resolved for collaboration to work: governance, finances, authority, and credibility. One major theme of the benefits of collaboration is the reorganizing of the governance of in-service and pre-service education. Not only can teachers effectively operate as planners and helpers in their own growth but the success of the program may depend upon it (Lawrence, 1977, Howey, et al 1981, and Herring and Howey, 1982). A reorganization may increase the participation of teachers and administrators and match the expertise of State Department of Public Instruction and university personnel to the needs of the schools. More

important, the alteration in power among schools, state departments and teacher education departments, which has occured as a matter of fact, would be established in a legal and organizational structure (Houston and Freiberg, 1979).

A governance structure will have to overcome some substantial obstacles to function effectively. The incentive for involvement in collaborative activities has been low. Job responsibilities, financial commitments, time allotments and skills for collaboration have not been a part of the educational scene. This gap may have come from a lack of awareness, but it may as easily come from a resistence to spending money on activities of the developments of skills that might be viewed with suspicion by colleagues, superiors or the public.

To support collaboration, then, a financial base needs to be developed that can handle governance costs as well as training, supervision and evaluation cost. The sources control and distribution of these funds may, in large part, determine the effectiveness of collaboration. In a higher education system where cost and income are tied to a course load basis the ability of the universities to deliver services to schools is limited (Roth, 1981). From the point of view of a school system, the cost of release time and the impact of the loss of experienced teachers from classrooms for a number of school days are serious questions (Hawley, 1978). A fiscal system that relates delivery of services to teachers or students as a basis for determining budgets may need to be applied to the collaborative efforts.

Another element of consideration is that previously in-service education has been funded by the participants. Moving certificates and beginning teaching in-service from a "as needed" basis to a required system alter the sources, decision-making and distribution of funds (Yarger and Mertens, 1976). The elements of governance and finances bring to light another major point that has been noted in the literature. Governance and finances are dependent upon the authority (Yarger and Mertens, 1976) that invest power and/or financial support to the governing body. The source of governance may come from coercive, legal, referent and reward basis of power (Hauerman, 1977). This authority, that in North Carolina comes from a legal basis, will affect the makeup and dispensing of funds. The authority of the N. C. Legislature, State Department of Public Instruction and Board of Governor will affect the expectations, control and financial support for governance.

The purpose of a collaborative effort must go beyond the governance and financial issues. The collaborative efforts are intended to plan, deliver and evaluate teacher education programs. As noted in the benefits, economic savings, use of agencies' strengths, increasing school input, appropriateness of in-service, strengthening curriculum and increasing research are potential outcomes of collaboration. From the list above, it is clear that delivery and outcomes of the collaborative process are some of the most attractive elements. The impediment in delivery are ones of credibility -- which services are delivered to which groups and by whom. At a pre-service, induction or in-service level, the involvement of schools in decision-making and teaching will be as critical as the involvement of universities in in-service. In the present alignment of

responsibilities and control of these elements, the parties often question the ability of the other parties to deliver quality input. Universities may fear that schools are based on "folkways" (Kysilka, 1973) rather than research and theory while schools perceive the university faculty as out of touch and, in many cases, dated in their approaches (Gore, 1972). This obstacle reduces potential involvement in skills that can be contributed.

One element not discussed by Yarger and Mertens (1976) is the control of the evaluation of collaboration. It appears that every collaborative effort would need an ongoing evaluative process to determine the impact of collaboration on the agencies and the effectiveness of activities to determine if they reach their goals. The audience would be the collaboration agencies. A second evaluative structure would assess the outcome of the collaboration. The audience would be the agencies with financial and/or authoritative responsibility.

The review of literature has presented view points collaboration on agencies involved in collaborative efforts. This discussion, while focused on the joint resolution set forward in North Carolina, has depended on the literature found in journals. A significant question not yet answered is "What is the understanding and attitudes of educators in North Carolna who participate in collaborative efforts?" The next section of the discussion will focus on the responses of a sample of North Carolina educators to survey and interviews related to issues of collaboration.

B. Survey and Interviews of Local Educators

Introduction:

The collaboration survey and interviews are an integral part of the overall assessment of cooperative efforts among educational agencies. By polling neighboring school districts, the survey assessed the levels of cooperation and desires to collaborate with other agencies within a region of North Carolina.

This survey focuses on the present state of cooperation among selected educational agencies of North Carolina in an effort to identify areas that have been developed and areas that may be potential areas of development in the future.

The Survey:

A ten item instrument was constructed that permits choices from a list of alternatives. The respondents are asked to rank the three most important alternatives from the list. The major topics of the survey were (1) the parties responsible for teacher performance, (2) present collaborative efforts, (3) desired efforts, (4) benefits and obstacles to collaboration, and (5) elements of collaboration that respondents would support. The survey is reproduced in Appendix I.

The sample was drawn from four school districts of Region Six in North Carolina. Using a random stratified sample, the respondents were grouped as elementary teachers, junior high school teachers, high school teachers, school administrators and university faculty. Three hundred and ten surveys were mailed. Interviews were designed to complement the survey by probing the same topics through eliciting complex responses to the questions, permitting suggestions and requesting specifics about benefits and problems of

collaboration in North Carolina. Interviewees were drawn from a list of people with experience in collaboration (Appendix II). The participants are listed in Appendix III.

For brevity a summary of the survey is provided. The complete survey is available from the collaborative research team. The percentage of returns were forty seven percent for the total group from a high of eighty two percent for administrators; to thirty three percent for high school teachers.

The experience of respondents ranged from beginning teachers (0-3 years) to very experienced educators (16 + years). Fifty percent of the respondents indicated they had more than eleven years of experience.

Present Efforts:

The present participation of educators in collaborative activities is quite high. Over ninety percent of all educators were involved in some cooperative relationship in the last five years. The greatest involvement is attendance at workshops, with over seventy five percent of the responding teachers involved. Fifty seven percent of the administrators participated in workshops. School teachers have been involved in the supervision of students from a low of twenty two percent for high school teachers to twenty seven percent for elementary school teachers. Over fifty three percent of the school administrators and eighty five percent of post secondary school faculty were involved in student teaching supervision. The planning, instruction and evaluation of field experience programs had less participation. School teachers reported that their involvement ranged from a high of twelve percent participating in planning of field experiences to a low of zero percent for evaluation and instruction.

The role of teachers and to some degree administrators has been on the "taking" end of activities. Relationships such as planning, instructing or advising - relationships included in collaboration-involved only a limited number of public school professionals.

Desired Relationships:

Over ninety percent of the educators were interested in cooperative activities. Many levels of desired involvement were more complex than present levels of cooperation. Teachers were interested in supervision of field based experiences, however, administrators and post secondary faculty were interested in reducing their participation in that area of collaboration.

SUPERVISION OF FIELD BASED EXPERIENCES

	Present	Desired	Change
Elementary	27.3	42.4	+15.1
Middle	26.3	42.1	+15.8
High School	22.2	33.3	+11.1
Administration	43.6	39.3	-4.3
Post-Secondary Instructors	85.0	65.0	-20.0

Responses to questions about planning, instruction and evaluation indicated some changes between present and desired levels of involvement by school teachers. More interest was shown by the middle school teachers in all areas, Elementary teachers expressed interest in planning, and administrators showed

interest in planning and instructing in field experience programs. Post secondary educators were interested in expanding their involvement in the evaluation of programs.

Overall, desired changes were in the direction of more involvement and indicated willingness for increased responsibility in areas of perceived expertise.

Teacher Quality:
Responsibility for teacher performance is perceived as spread over a wide range of agencies and groups. No group listed on the survey was omitted by the respondents. The percentage of educators choosing an agency or group ranged from a high of one hundred percent for Public School Administrators to fifteen percent for N. C. elected officials.

School Teachers, Building Administrators, Public School Administrators and Post Secondary Instruction were named in over fifty percent of the responses. The first choice by all groups was clear. School Teachers were perceived as having the most responsibility for the quality of teacher performance. N. C. elected officials and the public were considered of having limited responsbility.

Benefits and Impediments:
Major benefits and impediments of collaboration to respondents were:

Benefits	Impediments
Increased practical aspects of teacher education	Lack of time
Increased sharing of resources	Lack of financial support
Increased communication	Overburden agencies with planning, implementing and/or evaluating for collaboration
Increased consensus on educational goals	

Collaboration:
Collaborative planning received support from all areas of the profession. All collaborative efforts were valued by all groups with planning, implementation and evaluation of teacher education program receiving the most support.

Survey and Interview Implications:
Respondents to the survey and interviews, in general, were consistent with findings of the literature. They were overwhelming in favor of collaboration, saw the need to be involved and welcomed increased cooperative efforts. In general, their concerns were related to little time, limited finances, and overwork. In other ways, the results were similar to other report findings, respondents have limited involvement with complex collaborative efforts, but believe they had skills to contribute.

The attractive ideals of collaboration, however, do not translate into clear action among the participants. In the survey, there was no clear-cut direction to the results. Respondents assigned equal weight to all items regardless of

the degree or type of collaboration. If these were typical responses of educators from North Carolina then the value and participation in collaboration will be high, but they indicate that there is only limited awareness and understanding of the concept.

C. Existing Models

In 1976 Sam Yarger and Sally Mertens stated in their presentation "About the Education of Teachers — A letter to Virginia"

> Now, in response to your questions "Is there a delivery model for the professional development of teachers that effectively bridges pre-service and in-service education?", we regret Virginia we...must answer your inquiry in the negative."

The authors say that the concept was an empty one and awaiting attributes. By 1982 attributes of collaboration and models of collaboration were available although the degree of collaboration and effectiveness were still under question (Yarger, 1979).

It has been suggested throughout this paper that collaboration must be a method to develop what Drs. Yarger and Mertens suggested in 1976 did not exist—A Continuum from Pre-service through In-service. This is the focus of the collaborative efforts under the Quality Assurance Program and the purpose of designing a model. Five key features of a successful continuum seem to be:

1. Collaboration
2. Comprehensive Centers
3. Beginning Teaching Component (Induction Training)
4. Professional Development for Experienced Teachers
5. Career Long Development (Ferver, 1980)

When these features are taken into account, the potential of success of a collaborative model will be much higher. But to collaborate for what purpose?

It has been suggested that collaboration is central to reform (Johnson, 1980) because of a spread of power to agencies other than higher education. In addition, Andrews (1980) states that the teaching profession will continue to use three separate agencies to handle pre-service, in-service and continuing education if an umbrella agency is not developed. Yarger and Mertens (1976) suggest that teacher education is neither pre-service and in-service nor a homogenous group, rather it is at least five subgroups starting from pre-education through experienced teachers as noted in Figure 1 below. The needs, capabilities and orientation of each of these groups need to be responded to under a sequential concept of teacher education. The purpose of collaboration then is to fulfil this need.

FIGURE 1

Pre-Education Student	Education Student	Initial Teacher	Developing Teacher	Experienced Teacher

In many cases, existing models reviewed for this report did not meet the sequential organization that underpins the Quality Acceptance Program document. Two models that represent the developmental concept are included in the report. Other models have specific elements that are interesting and worth consideration, these unique elements are reported.

Many models have been developed for statewide adoption. Perhaps one of the best known is the Florida Teacher Center Act. Briefly, the act requires:

1. A teacher education center exists in each school district
2. Planning, financing and staffing are joint responsibilities of schools and colleges
3. Staff development programs are approved by the State Department of Education
4. Centers are housed in the school district
5. Programs include credit, noncredit, pre-service and in-service activities
6. Funding is on a per pupil basis by the state
7. State supported higher education personnel who are assigned to the centers with funding by the state
8. Services may be purchased from non-public colleges
9. Teacher education centers have councils with a majority of classroom teachers
10. The state council for teacher education center has been created by the stae and appointed by the governor. The majority are teachers.

An alternate method is to use the organizational system available. This tactic was used by the Massachusetts Commonwealth In-service Institute which offers

1. In-service which meets state and national priorities
2. Funding for groups who plan programs which have been approved by the Board of Education
3. Support in a variety of areas such as Adult Education, Special Education, and Bilingual Education
4. Options through six regional centers for staff development
5. A sub-committee at the centers for oversight of in-service institutes
6. Funding based on existing reallocated state monies

Many other models are available in the literature or are operating in North Carolina. These would include the Building Approach (Smith, 1965), Inter-University Model (Corrigan, 1965), Mercer County Teacher Education Center (1980), Metrolina Consortium (1980) and the Planning Correlation Council. These models have elements that should be reviewed.

The Building Approach:

A building based center could use teachers and university faculty to teach student teachers. The unique quality of the model is the involvement of many building personnel in the training of teachers. Each school has a strong commitment to the education program of pre-service teachers and gains some control over content of pre-service teacher education. The university works with the knowledge that the staff can integrate field experiences with courses in the educational programs of student teachers.

Inter-University Model:
In the Inter-University Model, school teachers are involved in the planning of programs for pre-service and in-service teachers. The strengths of the Inter-University Project come from the involvement of school faculty in decision-making, attempts of parity through designation of teachers as "associates," the development of school in-service for teachers, the analysis of school learning to improve schools as well as offer high quality settings to pre-service teachers.

Mercer County Teacher Education Center:
A pre-service and in-service center for teacher education. Involvement of schools and universities is based on superivison of resources and desire to use the center to meet programatic needs. (The charter of this center is duplicated in Appendix IV. Clear areas of responsibility are outlined and contractual arrangements are specific. Financial support is contributed by all parties involved, therefore, these groups desire a degree of input and accountability over the center. There is a "something for everybody" quality to the center because of the financial inputs from all sources.

The Metrolina Consortium:
Based in Charlotte is an consortium of UNC-Chapel Hill, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools and UNC-Charlotte. The consortium is both a reactive and proactive organization. It can initiate an action, but it also can aid any of its member organizations or individuals in creating programs, in-service or research. It acts as a broker and umbrella group for short term collaborative activities.

Planning Correlation Council:
The Planning Correlation Council (PCC) is a voluntary agency of the Region VI in North Carolina. Its goals and major purposes have been the develoment of programs at the in-service level. It is basically an information exchange to aid coordination of programs and to plan meetings, demonstrations and staff development activities. The ad hoc quality of the PCC's ventures permit a great deal of risk taking not available to the individual agencies involved in the council. A success or failure is not "visited" upon any one agency nor will future plans be materially effected by a failure. On the other hand, successful programs can be incorporated into existing structures.

Summary of Existing Models of Collaboration:
The models presented represent varied approaches to the problems and benefits of developing teacher education through collaboration. The models are representative rather than inclusive of all possible types, and components of models are outlined rather than delineated. At this point some major elements are apparent, however, elements vary significantly from model to model.

In the area of goals, it is apparent that the purposes of collaboration may range from mandated collaboration for compliance with a legislated goal to an "ad hoc" informal agreement to share information or barter services.

Governance may vary over an equally broad range. Some collaborative structures may be formal in roles and duties such as the Mercer County Teacher Center Model. An "ad hoc" sub-committee model may be a term arrangement but all financial and managerial aspects are negotiable.

Functions of the models vary but are connected by some strong elements. They operate within the legal or bureaucratic limits given them by their parent organizations. Only a limited number of collaborative groups have the capability to seek external fundings. The collaborative structure rarely sets goals separate from the parent organization unless they are functioning as a "high risk" organization such as the PCC or a teacher center. In these cases, often powerful individuals with institutional ties or highly visible people are involved in developing ideas. Successful programs developed by these individuals are adopted from the high risk group, whole or in part, into the institution.

The capacity of collaborative organization is, in most cases, set by its parent organizations. One additional element not directly noted is the ability to use the resources given to the collaborative groups. This is dependent upon institutional or individual will or commitment to the collaborative effort.

For North Carolina, it is apparent that a long term, stable model will be needed. The purpose of the collaborative model is to act as a major part of the development process on the education of teachers. The literature and existing models of collabortion point toward a use of financial, resource and personnel support that alters previous structures of responsibility and changes the roles and functions of agencies. These issues will be addressed in the model section of the paper. The Quality Assurance Program has an underlying structures that presuppose certain elements exist.

D. Assumptions and Limitations

The first assumption is that North Carolina will continue to offer education to professionals from teacher preparation through retirement. Second, it is assumed that all agencies presently involved in education of teachers will continue to be involved. The table developed by Sampson (1980) describes the role of agency involvement in various functions. It is assumed that North Carolina's agencies function in a smiliar manner.

ROLE RELATIONSHIPS

	FUNCTION				
Participant	Preparation	Induction	In-Service	Continuing Education	Professional Development
The University	Primary	Joint	Resource	Primary	Resource
The Employing Agency	Resource	Joint	Primary	Secondary	Resource
The Licensing Agency	Review & Approval	—	Review & Approval	License Renewal	—
The Professional Association	Resource	Resource	Resource	Provider	Provider
The Educator	Prescribed	Joint	Resource	Resource	Resource

Sampson has used the following definitions in constructing this table.

Pre-service Education - that phase of teacher preparation accomplished before initial certification.

Induction (Beginning) Education - that phase of teacher preparation that is planned by the teacher preparation institution and schools occurs during the first two or three years of teacher activity.
In-Service Education - consists of those activities organized to meet a school or program need, usually done on school time and paid for by the school.
Continuing Education - consists of those activities undertaken by individual educators on their own time for the maintenance or improvement of their general professional competence.
Professional Development - consists of those activities which enable the individual to make greater contributions to the field or qualify for higher level responsibilities.
Primary - major responsibility for content, form and delivery.
Secondary - cooperation to assure that function can be carried out.
Resource - Cooperates and makes service available.
Joint - shares responsibility for content, form, and delivery.
Review and Approval - legislated authority.
License Renewal - legislated authority.
Provider - active or optional role.
Prescribed - set by university. (pp. 6-8)

Further assumptions are parties are skilled in collaborative decision-making; mutual benefits are perceived by all parties; skills exist in all agencies that are useful to other agencies; and involvement is long-term.

A limit of the model to be presented is that each agency involved in a state model would have very different settings and circumstances. Some schools and universities are located in proximity while others are distant. Likewise, some agencies are limited in staff while others may be over-staffed. The qualities affect implementation of the model in unforseen ways.

Given these assumptions and limits, the model outlined in the following section is recommended as a direction for North Carolina.

III. The Model

A. Description

In the development of a collaborative model to fulfill the goals of the joint resolution, we have reviewed the literature, surveyed North Carolina educators and analyzed existing models. From the findings some elements have emerged.

1. Collaboration must include elements of authority, governance, finances, delivery of services and evaluation. These elements must occur at every level of the collaborative effort from state to local levels.

2. Involvement of classroom teachers is critical for success.

3. Financial resources must be committed from all sources to insure participation.

4. Governance should include personnel from all agencies and all levels within an agency.

5. Universities must be involved as partners in inductive/in-service activities, and the present role and funding must change.

6. Schools must be involved as partners in pre-service education.

7. Schools and universities must learn to use each other's skills and aid in fostering creditibility between the groups.

The recommended model is called the Teacher Education Center Model and draws on elements of existing state-wide models, conceptual models and research findings. The structure of the Teacher Center Model includes the basic elements that will need to be in place to insure collaboration.

Purpose:
The goals of the Teacher Education Center Model is to aid in the implementation of the goals of the Quality Assurance Plan through a collaborative structure and to involve teachers and other professionals in career long involvement to improve instruction.

Authority:
The overall authority rests with the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. The coordination of these agencies for funding and directing the policy of the Quality Assurance Program in all areas of the state is necessary to develop a high level of implementation of the Qualified Assurance Program guidelines and a high standard of performance. An on-going board to oversee the process is necessary. It should represent teachers, administrators, universities, state department of public instruction, professional organizations and the public.

Governance:
Regional Teacher Education Councils should be formed to offer guidance in policy and financial matters. The council will use the present geographical region as a base. Councils represent all school districts, colleges and universities with teacher education programs, professional organizations, and the State Department of Public Instruction within the region however, not all agencies would have representatives. The upper limit for the council would be eleven members. Teachers would fill six of these positions. Two school administrators would be chosen along with two faculty from institutions of higher education and one state department official. All members should receive training in collaborative decision making.

A Teacher Education Center Board for policy implementation, finance planning and decision-making would be located at a central location in each school district to serve pre-service and in-service teachers. The center board would at least have eleven members including building principals, classroom teachers, the public, college supervisors and pre-service students who would determine and request services needed. Selection to the board would be by recommendations of teachers, superintendents, the higher education community and state department regional centers. The Center would be planned, financed and staffed jointly by the school district and one or more college or university. Plans to be approved by the regional council.

Financial:

Funds are committed through various sources. State funds would be allocated to the site based on either ADA or Professional Staff basis.[1] In addition, funds for a teacher candidate who has passed the Core I Battery would be given to the Institute of High Education for use only in the Teacher Education Center attended by the pre-service student.

Institutions of Higher Education would commit a laboratory fee from student teachers in the range of 60.00 to 100.00 to the center. This fee would be in addition to tuition. More than half of the fee would go to the cooperating teachers while the remainder is used by the Teacher Education Center for pre-service, beginning teacher, and cooperating teacher development.

School districts commit a base fund for induction and cooperating teacher costs. In addition, other funds are supplied for in-service activities as desired by the teachers and administrators of the district.

Delivery of Services:

Services are delivered to pre-service, induction (beginning), and in-service educators based on the intent of the Quality Assurance Program, but the centers are to serve a broader audience of experienced teachers and administrators who can grow through their involvement in the induction of teachers into the profession.

If a staff member was requested from a school district, college or university for assignment, part or full time to the center, the staff would be paid for by the state for services.

Services provided would include:

* Pre-service instruction by field based programs.
* In-service for career development and professional development.
* Problem solving of unforeseen issues.
* Special services such as consultants, special events or resources but would not include travel, substitutes or meals.
* Evaluation of center performance.

Along with services designed to aid pre-service, induction and in-service teachers meet the goals of the Quality Assurance Program, the centers can provide as part of their plan

1. credit-noncredit courses,
2. ongoing-onetime activities,
3. 3 year plans for induction or in-service teachers.

---

1 Funding on ADA has been 2.50 to 5.00 per student in other states (1982 figure), or funding on a Professional Staff Plan from 25.00 to 35.00 per staff member.

Evaluation:
Centers would be monitored for pre-service, induction and in-service education. The center should meet the goals of the Quality Assurance Program and other goals set by the local center.

B. Characteristics of the Model

The model is intended to be a flexible instrument of the agencies involved in the delivery of education to teachers in the state. It supports the development of plans to meet the guidelines of the Quality Assurance Program and permits the growth of elements deemed appropriate by regional councils and local teacher education center boards. Some of the significant features of the model include

1. Involvement of pre-service through in-service teachers in all phases of the teacher education center program.

2. Allowance for planning to be started at the local or at the state level.

3. Involvement of university faculty and school faculty in all areas of the education of teachers.

4. Contributions of services, funds and resources from all sources.

5. Ability to meet local and state needs.

6. Place state university faculty on an "in load" basis.

7. Retain some features of the present system of relationships among state department, schools and colleges.

C. Implementation of the Model

The implementation of a collaborative model will take skills and time. It is suggested that two lines of support be developed to implement collaboration. First, an awareness and discussion component will be developed. The awareness sessions conducted by a collaborative team of school, college and state department personnel for administrators, and staff of all affected institutions. In addition, specialists in the field of collaboration such as Sam Yarger, William Smith, Pat Zagarmi, Ken Howey, and others should be brought in to address major constituencies. A brief document outlining the elements of the Quality Assurance Program and its many collaborative facets should be made available to all educators.

Parallel to this awareness and discussion component would be the development of two pilot projects that would explore promises and obstacles to collaboration.

An experienced center would involve agencies that had a high degree of collaborative expertise. This center could serve as a model for other centers by exemplifying effective center activities and roles for individuals. The center will permit a documentation team to observe, interview and record collaboration activities.

The team would compile a list of skills, resources and time frames needed to create high level collaboration. The documentation team would work with the center staff to create a handbook that could be used by all groups involved in collaboration.

A second project would involve parties new to collaboration efforts who would design and start the collaborative process. This pilot center would also be documented by observation, interview and records. The purpose of this study would be to determine what steps were necessary to increase collaboration. A "Start-Up" Handbook would be developed for beginning enterprises. The handbook might include purposes of collaboration, methods to increase collaboration, "pitfalls," reasonable expectations, role definition, and measure of levels of implementation of collaboration.

It is suggested that support and expectations for Teacher Education Centers be in the form of a set of guidelines from documentation teams to determine beginning, developing and experienced centers. This component would clearly note the difference in expected performance, give direction for improvement and increase the consistancy of performance in centers across the state.

D. Implications and Recommendations for Implementation

The Quality Assurance Program is a bold plan that can change the face of teacher education in North Carolina. This task will take substantial changes in both the structure of organizations and the thinking of individuals. Implications for organization would include:

1. Changes in decision-making process.
2. Alterations of funding for services.
3. Involvement in areas previously unexplored.
4. Reassignment of staff.
5. Reassessment of reward systems.
6. Reorganization of in-service and pre-service programs.

The implications for individuals would:

1. Analysis of personal skills for use in teacher education.
2. Potential retraining.
3. Redefining involvement in teacher education.
4. Developing collaborative decision-making skills.

Other recommendations:

- Alternate models should be explored. The state of knowledge about collaborative effort is limited and other models should be considered.

- Training in collaborative decision-making will be necessary for all members, simulations may be a necessary element of in-service.

- School - Post-Secondary exchanges should be considered.

- An associate or resource postiion could be established for superior teachers to work in university settings.

- Any reward system must be state-wide or less wealthy districts will be unable to compete.

- Reward system at the university/college level that recognizes field based work with products.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benderson, Albert. "Teacher Competence." Focus, 1982, 10, 1-24.

Boyer, Earnest. "Schools and Universities Need Each Other." Education Leadership, 1975, 556.

Calhoun, Thomas. "Throwaway Teachers." Educational Leadership, 1975, 32, 310-312.

Caruso, Joseph J. "Collaboration of School, College, and Community: A Bridge To Progress." Educational Leadership, 1981, 38, 558-562.

Devlin-Sherer, Wade, et. al. Syracuse University Collaboration Project. Unpublished papers, 1982.

Dill, David D. "Cutting the Cake: The Relationship Between School and College." High School Journal, April, 1977, 287-301.

Drummond, W. H. "Components of Effective In-Service Delivery System." In-Service, Syracuse, New York: National Council of States on In-Service Education, April, 1979, 14-21.

Durkin, L. and Smith, J. M. "A Challenge for Leadership of Teacher Educators in the Eighties." Peabody Journal of Education, 1981, 58(4), 183-87.

Fever, J. C., "University Collaboration in School In-Service." Unpublished Report, University of Wisconsin Sytem, 1980.

Gebhardt, Richard "Teamwork and Feedback: Broadening the Base of Collaborative Writing" College English, 1980, 42(1), 69-74.

Gore, Joseph. "Collegial Ambience: Its Necessity in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 3, p.3.

Hagberg, Hilma and Walker, Decker. "Working It Out Together." Educational Leadership, 1981, 38, 563-565.

Hauerman, B. "Collaboration and Power Bases" A.T.E., Atlanta, GA, July, 1977.

Havelock, R. G. Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Center for Research of Utilization of Scientific Knowledge (CRUSK), Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, January, 1971.

Hawley, Steve and Branch, Jan "Analysis of Core Questions in the Theory-Practice Gap. Paper A. T. E., February, 1978. (ERIC ED 159 160).

Herring, William M. and Howey, Kenneth R. "Research In, On, and By Teacher Centers," Far West Laboratory, July, 1982.

Housten, R.W., and Freiberg, J. H. "Perpetral Motion, Blind Man's Bluff and In-Service Education," Journal of Teacher Education, Jan.-Feb., 1979 (301 78).

Hough, Wendell M. "School-University Partnership for Teacher Growth." Educational Leadership, 1975, 32, 307-309.

Howey, Kenneth R., Bents, Richard, and Corrigan, Dean. EDS. School Focused In-Service: Descriptions and Discussions, Association of Teacher Educators, 1981.

Hoyt, Kenneth. "Community Resources for Career Education." Washington, D.C., US Government Printing Office, 1976.

Hurwitz, E., et. al. "Accepting Cooperation between School Districts and Universities: A Case Study and Guidelines," Washington, D.C., 1974, (ERIC ED 124 843).

Kaufman, L. Jand and Morgan, Paul J. (Ed.) The Center Concept in Southern West Virginia, Mercer County Teacher Education Center, 1976.

Kazlov, G. "A National Survey of the Clinical Professorship in Teacher Education." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 1543A.

Kysilka, Marcella L. "The University's Role in the Preservice Education of Teachers." Educational Leadership. 1973, 30, 425-427.

Lawrence, G. et al "Patterns of Effective In-Service," Syracuse, NY National Council of States on In-Service Education. Syracuse University, 1977.

McDonald, Robert H. and Wolfe, Denny T., Jr. "Chautaugua: Reaching Out in the 80's." The Clearinghouse, 1980 54, 182-184.

Moseley, Patricia A. "Teacher Preparation: A Shared Responsibility." Educational Leadership, 1973, 30, 408-415.

"The Need for Quality, A Report to the Southern Regional Education Board by its Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools." June, 1981. (ERIC ED 205 133).

O'Reilly, R. C. "Changing Qualification and Endorsement Programs. (ERIC ED 207 193).

Pankratz, Roger and Williams, John. Three Years of Collaboration in the Development of Portal Schools. June, 1974 (ED 099 391).

Robbins, J. "Planning for Teacher Education in the 80's: Who Will Be The Gatekeeper?" 1978 (ERIC ED 155-165).

Roth, Robert A. "External Influences on Teacher Education Curriculum Development." Journal of Teacher Education. 1981, 32, 3.

Rowls, M., and Hanes, J. "Teacher Recertification: The Shift Toward Local Control and Governance." Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 33(4), 24-28.

Schwartz, Henrietta. "When University and Schools Relate." Educational Leadership, 1973, 30, 397-400.

Smith, E. Brooks "Cooperative Structures in School-College Relationships for Teacher Education." The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1965 (ED 014 485)

Smith, E. Brooks Needed: A New Order in Student Teaching that Brings Jont Accountability for Professional Development, October, 1968. (ERIC ED 023 624).

Yarger, Sam J., "Some Uncomfortable Assertions about Collaboration." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April, 1979.

Yarger, Sam J., Howey, Kenneth E., and Joyce, Bruce In-Service Teacher Education, Palo Alto, California. Booksend Laboratories, 1980.

Yarger, Sam J. and Mertens, Sally K. "About the Education of Teacher - A Letter to Virginia" National Council of States on In-Service Education, November, 1976.

Weaver, J. "Collaboration: Why is Sharing the Turf so Difficult?" Journal of Teacher Education, Jan-Feb, 1981. XXX IT(1)24-25.

Weiss, Marvin W. "A Challenge For the Future." December, 1976. (EDRS ED 132 991).

APPENDIX I

Dear Professional Educator:

We need your help in understanding the present collaboration efforts among schools, colleges, and other educational agencies in professional preparation of teachers. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and return it to us in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. We are working on a time line and would appreciate the return of your survey by Wednesday, September 22, 1982.

The survey gathers information to aid in the design and development of collaboration efforts for the improvement of teacher education as mandated in the joint resolution of the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. The joint resolution, Quality Assurance for Professional Personnel, is a multidimensional, systematic approach to the strengthening of teacher preparation and professional certification. This research project is one effort to obtain your ideas. Your cooperation in the completion of this survey is greatly appreciated.

The Collaboration Research Team:
Willa Bryant, Livingstone College
Doris Buchanan, Jackson Park School
Ann Keen, A. L. Brown High School
Betty Pardue, Jackson Park School
Ned Robinette, Kannapolis City Schools
Gene Schaffer, UNC-Charlotte

APPENDIX II

September 10, 1982

Dr. Gail Huffman
College of Human Development
and Learning
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223

Dear Dr. Huffman:

In an effort to facilitate the Quality Assurance Program established jointly by the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, Livingstone College, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and Kannapolis City Schools jointly planned a proposal designed to develop structures and processes for Effective Collaboration Among Local Schools, Colleges and Universities. This proposal was funded and we are working toward the achievement of our objective.

An integral part of our plan is to get input from professionals. Consequently, we are inviting a selected group to attend a luncheon meeting Thrusday, September 23, 1982 at Western Sizzling Steak House, 1021 South Cannon Boulevard, Kannapolis at 12:30 p.m. At this time, we will discuss ways for local schools, colleges and universities to collaborate effectively.

We would be pleased if you would join us on this occasion. If you are able to do so, please let us know by September 17, 1982 at (704) 633-7960 Ext. 71. Any questions you may have regarding this meeting may be answered at this number also.

Sincerely,

The Collaboration Research Team

Dr. Willa C. Bryant
Livingstone College

Mrs. Doris Buchanan, Principal
Jackson Park School

Ms. Ann Keen, Teacher
A. L. Brown High School

Mrs. Betty Pardue, Teacher
Jackson Park School

Mr. Ned G. Robinette, Assistant Superintendent
Kannapolis City Schools

WCB:ndr

Dr. Gene Schaffer
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

COLLABORATION SURVEY

Background Information

___ Teacher, Elementary School
___ Teacher, Middle or Junior High School
___ Teacher, High School
___ Building Administrator
___ Central Office Personnel
___ University Faculty

Your Professional Experience in Years:

___ 0-3 ___ 4-10 ___ 11-15 ___ 16 and over

___ A ___ G ___ Other (Please Specify)

___ Urban ___ Suburban ___ Small City ___ Rural

1. WHAT RELATIONSHIPS HAVE YOU HAD WITH COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS?

(Please check all appropriate boxes.)

___ None
___ Attend Workshops
___ Teach Workshops
___ Attend Classes
___ Teach Classes
___ Attend Field-Based Graduate Program
___ Supervise Student Teachers
___ Plan Field Experience Programs*
___ Instruct in Field Experience Programs
___ Evaluate Field Experience Programs
___ Member of Board of Education or Advisory board

___ Other _____ (Specify)

*(field experience is any experience in schools: i.e. observation, small group instruction, or student teaching)

2. WHAT RELATIONSHIPS WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE WITH UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS?

(Please check all appropriate boxes.)

___ Note
___ Attend Workshops
___ Teach Workshops
___ Attend Classes
___ Teach Classes
___ Attend Field-Based Graduate Program
___ Supervise Student Teachers
___ Plan Field Experience Programs
___ Instruct in Field Experience Programs
___ Evaluate Field Experience Programs
___ Member of Board of Education or Advisory board

___ Other _____ (Specify)

3. WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE QUALITY OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE?

(Please check all appropriate boxes.)

	RANK
___ School Teachers	___
___ Building Administrators	___
___ Public School Administrators	___
___ University Faculty	___
___ State Department of Public Instruction	___
___ Professional Associations	___
___ Public	___
___ N. C. Elected Officials	___

4. PLEASE RETURN TO ITEM 3 ABOVE AND RANK THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT GROUPS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. RANK MOST IMPORTANT GROUP #1, SECOND GROUP #2, AND THIRD MOST IMPORTANT GROUP #3

5. WHAT BENEFITS MIGHT DERIVE FROM COLLABORATION AMONG EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (Schools, Colleges, State Department of Public Instruction and Professional Associations)?

(Please check all appropriate boxes.)

	RANK
___ Increased Communication Among Agencies	___
___ Increased Sharing of Resources	___
___ Increased Consensus on Educational Goals	___
___ Incresed Practical Aspects of Teacher Education	___
___ Increased Use of Research Findings in Classrooms	___
___ Increased Guidance from Schools on Content in Teacher Education	___
___ Increased Participation in Selection of Qualified Teachers	___
___ Increased Use of Current Methods n Classrooms	___
___ Other (Please Specify)_____	___

6. PLEASE RETURN TO ITEM 5 ABOVE AND RANK THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ANSWERS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. RANK MOST IMPORTANT ANSWER #1, SECOND ANSWER #2, AND THIRD MOST IMPORTANT ANSWER #3.

7. WHAT PROBLEMS MIGHT DERIVE FROM COLLABORATION AMONG EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (Schools, Colleges, State Department of Public Instruction and Professional Associations)?

(Please check all appropriate boxes.)

	RANK
___ Lack of Time	___
___ Lack of Financial Support	___
___ Lack of Equal Decision-Making Among Educational Agencies	___
___ Overburden Agencies with Planning, Implementing, and/or Evaluating for Collaboration	___
___ Conflict in Responsibilities to Public School Students Versus Student Teachers	___
___ Lack of Rewards for Collaboration	___
___ Other (Please Specify) _____	___

8. PLEASE RETURN TO ITEM 7 ABOVE AND RANK THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ANSWERS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. RANK MOST IMPORTANT ANSWER #1, SECOND ANSWER #2, AND THIRD MOST IMPORTANT ANSWER #3.

9. WHAT FORMS OF COLLABORATION WOULD YOU SUPPORT AMONG EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES?

(Please check all appropriate boxes.)

	RANK
___ Cooperative Planning of Teacher Education Programs	___
___ Cooperative Implementation of Teacher Education Programs	___
___ Cooperative Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs	___
___ Exchange Personnel Among Schools, Universities, and Other Educational Agencies	___
___ Cooperative Planning of In-Service Programs	___
___ Participation in Research in Schools	___
___ Cooperative Planning of Field Experiences	___
___ Cooperative Boards for Decision-Making and Feedback to Educational Agencies	___
___ Other (Please Specify) _____	___

10. PLEASE RETURN TO ITEM 9 ABOVE AND RANK THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT ANSWERS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. RANK MOST IMPORTANT ANSWER #1, SECOND ANSWER #2, AND THIRD MOST IMPORTANT ANSWER #3.

Do you know of any examples of programs collaboration among educational agencies?

_____

APPENDIX III
Interviews

Ms. Clarice Hornbuckle
Staff Development Center
Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System
Charlotte, NC

Dr. Betsy Detty
Director of Instruction
Salisbury City School
Salisbury, NC

Mrs. Doris Buchanan
Principal
Jackson Park School
Kannapolis, NC

Dr. Martha West
General Supervisor
Rowan County School
Salisbury, NC

Dr. Gail Huffman
Chairperson
Educational Leadership & Instruction
University of North Carolina - Charlotte
Charlotte, NC

Ms. Anne Keen
Teacher
A. L. Brown High School
Kannapolis, NC

Mrs. Betty Pardue
Teacher
Jackson Park School
Kannapolis, NC

Ms. Jean Owen
Principal
Duncan School
Salisbury, NC

Mr. James Nesbit
Staff Development Center
Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System
Charlotte, NC

Mr. Ned Robinette
Assistant Superindendent
Kannapolis City School
Kannapolis, NC

Mr. Eugene C. Schaffer
Educational Leadership &
Instruction
UNC - Charlotte
Charlotte, NC

Dr. Willa Bryant
Department of Education
Livingstone College
Salisbury, NC

Mr. Robert Byrd
Acting Executive Director
Region IV - SDPI
Albemarle, NC

APPENDIX IV

COUNTY TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER
By-Laws

Article I
Name

The Name of this body shall be the Teacher Education Center.

Article II
Philosophy

The Teacher Education Center is convinced that teacher education functions best in a climate whereby colleges, the Department of education, county school systems, and local communities contribute to the implementation of effective teacher preparation programs.

Article III
Membership

The current composition of the Teacher Education Center includes College, County Schools, and the Department of Education. Each contributes financially to the support of the Center.

Article IV
The Advisory Committee

Cooperation and thoughtful dialogue are essential to the center concept of teacher education. To provide the vehicles of action and communication, the Advisory Committee for the Center must function in a meaningful and professional manner.

Composition

IV. The Committee is composed of the following representation:
- A. Voting Representation
  1. One member from each participating institution of higher education which contributes to the fiscal maintenance of the Center shall be appointed by said institution as long as said institution meets stated membership requirements.
  2. One representative shall be from the State Department of Education.
  3. Two members shall be designated by the Superintendent of County School.
- B. Non-Voting Represenation
  1. Each participating institution of higher education shall select two instructional staff members - one elementary and one secondary - who shall serve a two-year term.
  2. The Coordinator of Instructional Services, County Schools, shall be a permanent member of this committee.
  3. One elementary and one secondary principal working in the Center teacher-training programs shall be selected for a one-year membership by the elementary and secondary principals organizations.
  4. One elementary and one secondary teacher shall also be chosen for a one-year membership.

5. A representative from the community-at-large shall be appointed by the Advisory Committee for a one-year term.
6. A student representative shall be selected from participating institutions of higher education. Each institution shall be represented on alternate semesters.

Article V
Officers

The Committee shall elect from its membership such officers as it deems necessary. However, it must annually elect a chairman from the voting membership, who will fulfill the usual duties performed through the office of chairman.

Article VI
Governance

The Teacher Education Center shall be governed by the Advisory Committee which is responsible for the formulation and implementation of decisions pertaining to teacher preparation.

SECTION I ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

a. The advisory Committee will meet monthly on the third Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.
b. Responsibility for the preparation of the agenda rests with the chairman and the Coordinator. The Center Coordinator will send notices and the agenda to all committee members the week preceding the meeting.
c. Robert's **Rules of Order** shall serve as the basic format of organization.
d. A change in by-laws may be presented at any meeting of the Advisory Committee; formal voting, however must be delayed until the next meeting.
e. The Committee shall formulate policy which is deemed appropriate for the operation of the Teacher Education Center.
f. The Committee shall provide general supervision of the Center teacher education program including the approval of all experimental programs and the admission of the prospective student teachers from institutions of higher education not currently represented on the Committee. Whenever possible, no institutions of higher education wil be refused an opportunity to utilize the Center if such institution is approved by the State Department of Education as eligible to prepare teachers or if the institution is located in another state and such institution possesses NCATE accreditation. Other institutions or higher education are encouraged to apply to the Center and their applications will be evaluated by the Committee.

SECTION II OFFICERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. Chairman
   1. The chairman shall be elected annaully by a majority vote of the voting membership of the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education Center.
   2. The chairman shall preside at all meetings of the Advisory Committee.
   3. The chairman shall act on the behalf of the Committee for the immediate supervision of the activities of the Coordinator.

SECTION III COMMITTEES

Special committees may be appointed by the chairman with the approval of the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education Center.

Standing committees shall include:

1. Inservice Committee
2. Preservice Committee
3. Budget Committee
4. Field-Service Committee

Article VII
Center Staff

A. Coordinator

1. The Coordinator shall be selected by a majority vote of the voting membership of the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education Center and from candidates proposed by the Committee chairman or by nomination from a Committee member.
2. The Coordinator shall administer Center policy.
3. The Coordinator of the County Teacher Education Center shall serve as secretary to the Advisory Committee.

B. The Assistant Coordinator

1. The Assistant Coordinator shall be selected by a majority vote of the voting membership of the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education Center and from candidates proposed by the Committee chairman or by nomination from the Committee member.
2. The Assistant Coordinator shall be responsible to the Center Coordinator who administers the policies of the Advisory Committee.
3. The Assistant Coordinator shall implement the provisions of Center policy in regard to the public school tutorial and college-aide program on a regional basis.
4. The Assistant Coordinator shall assist the Center Coordinator in the preparation of reports, brochures, and other publications relative to the pre-professional program and in the implementation of Center inservice programs.

C. The Center Secretary

1. The Center secretary shall be selected by a majority vote of the voting membership of the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education Center and frm candidates proposed by the Committee chairman or by nomination from a Committee member.
2. The duties of the secretary shall include the preparation of materials necessary for communication and disemination.

Article VII
Preservice Experiences

The Center shall arrange preservice experiences as designated by the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education Center.

All preservice placements are to be made by the Center Coordinator and the Assistant Coordinator after approval by the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education center. Lists of completed placements shall be sent to the colleges and the

superintendents. Each participating principal will receive an accurate confirmation of placements for his school and a calendar of Center Activities. Each supervising/cooperating teacher, following initial contact by the Coordinator/Assistant Coordinator and the principal, will receive pertinent information from the Center.

After placement, changes shall be made only following a cooperative agreement by the participating agencies. All changes must be made through the Center Coordinator/Assistant Coordinator.

Article IX
Inservice Programs

Inservice programs shall be arranged by the Center on a regional basis for new supervising teachers, supervising teachers, cooperating teachers, and principals as determined by the Advisory Committee to the County Teacher Education Center.

Article X
Financing

A. The County Board of Education shall serve as fiscal agent for the Center.
B. Each member institution shall pay an annual fee of $5,000.00
C. State Department of Education shall provide additional funds for support and maintenance.
D. Each supervising teacher shall be paid according to the level of endorsement and the prorated assignment.
E. Building principals shall receive $5.00 per student teacher on a prorated basis.

Article XI
Evaluation

The Teacher Education Center shall engage in a continuous evaluation program, both internal and external.

In the internal evaluation, all Center activities shall be evaluated by informal evaluations. Participants will include those involved int he preservice and inservice programs. Complied results will be distributed to all members of the Advisory Committee. The results shall be used for program revisions and as guidelines for future inservice programs.

An external evaluation of the Center shall be made every three years.

ADAPTED FROM THE MERCER COUNTY TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

APPENDIX VI

LOOKING BACK

The following is a personal review made by the members of the research team as we reflected back on our collaborative efforts as a committee.

Most members agreed that a benefit of this collaborative effort was the better understanding of the North Carolina Quality Assurance Program, and its impact on the future of teacher education. We were given a chance to review literature, construct a survey, and conduct interviews; we felt this was beneficial in determining the knowledge, involvement and desires of local educators in relationship to school and university collaboration. All parties felt the chance to share perspectives, values, and interests as they related to the public schools and, particularly, the question of collaboration efforts was a unique and valuable experience.

The limits of the project were ones related to time, finances, and rewards. The time question was - the limited time available for work on the project. As the project began at the beginning of the school term and no release time was provided for this activity, it was difficult for us to devote the amount of time needed for organization, writing and editing of materials.

Another limitation cited by one of the members was the contribution of time and resouces of individuals not related to the project. Previous commitments were set aside and resouces were committed to the plan rather than normal activities. While possible in over a short period of time, this could not be sustained by an institution over a long period of time.

The benefits to members of a collaboration in the short-run outweigh the limits and problems encountered. However, for long term, on-going activities, there would need to be major alterations to collaborative efforts.

For the future, the first major problem needing to be addressed is the understanding and agreement of school and post-secondary administrators as to the value of the activities. A corollary of this is the support and use of the personnel involved in collaboration after a specific defined task has been completed. Too often skills learned are not used again. Second, a reward system needs to be devised for both school and post secondary educators involved in collaboration.

Finally, collaborative efforts are not part of the "job description" for school personnel and, while valued by the indivdual, the time is not perceived as a major function by school personnel. At the post-secondary level liaison work is a necessary part of the college, but is often remains an "aside" to the major purpose of the post-secondary program. Until the value of liaison/collaborative is fully recognized, the individual may suffer or the institution may commit only limited reserves to the project.